COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the full Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to consider S. 638, the Insular Development Act of 1995.

The hearing will take place Thursday, May 25, 1995, at 2 p.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

Those wishing to testify or who wish to submit written statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. For further information, please call Jim Beirne at (202) 224–2564 or Betty Nevitt at 202–224–0765.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

● Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report prepared by the Congressional Budget Office under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. This report meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of section 5 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for 1986.

This report shows the effects of congressional action on the budget through May 5, 1995. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues, which are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the concurrent resolution on the budget (H. Con. Res. 218), show that current level spending is below the budget resolution by $5.6 billion in budget authority and $1.4 billion in outlays. Current level is $0.5 billion over the revenue floor in 1995 and below by $9.5 billion over the 5 years 1995–99. The current estimate of the deficit for purposes of calculating the maximum deficit amount is $238 billion, $3.1 billion below the maximum deficit amount for 1995 of $241 billion.

Since my last report, dated April 24, 1995, there has been no action that affects the current level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues.

The report follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, May 8, 1995.

Hon. PETE DOMENICI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The attached report for fiscal year 1995 shows the effects of Congressional action on the 1995 budget and is current through May 5, 1995. The estimates of budget authority, outlays and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the 1995 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 218). This report is submitted under Section 308(b) and in aid of Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, and meets the requirements of Senate scorekeeping of Section 5 of S. Con. Res. 32, the 1986 First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget.

Since my last report, dated April 24, 1995, there has been no action that affects the current level of budget authority, outlays or revenues.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL,
Director.

THE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, FISCAL YEAR 1995, 104TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS MAY 5, 1995

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 218) [1]	Current level [2]	Current level over/under resolution
ON-BUDGET			
Budget authority	1,238.7	1,233.1	−5.6
Outlays	1,217.6	1,216.2	−1.4
Revenues:			
1995	977.7	978.2	0.5
1995–99	5,415.2	5,405.7	−9.5
Deficit	241.0	238.0	−3.1
Debt subject to limit	4,965.1	4,764.5	−200.6
OFF-BUDGET			
Social Security outlays:			
1995	287.6	287.5	−0.1
1995–99	1,562.6	1,562.6	[3] 0.
Social Security revenues:			
1995	360.5	360.3	−0.2
1995–99	1,998.4	1,998.2	−0.2

[1] Reflects revised allocation under section 9(g) of H. Con. Res. 64 for the Deficit-Neutral reserve fund.

[2] Current level represents the estimated revenue and direct spending effects of all legislation that Congress has enacted or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, full-year funding estimates under current law are included for entitlement and mandatory programs requiring annual appropriations even if the appropriations have not been made. The current level of debt subject to limit reflects the latest U.S. Treasury information on public debt transactions.

[3] Less than $50 million.

Note: Detail may not add due to rounding.

THE ON-BUDGET CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 104TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, SENATE SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS MAY 5, 1995

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
ENACTED IN PREVIOUS SESSIONS			
Revenues			978,466
Permanents and other spending legislation	750,307	706,236	
Appropriation legislation	738,096	757,783	
Offsetting receipts	(250,027)	(250,027)	
Total previously enacted	1,238,376	1,213,992	978,466
ENACTED THIS SESSION			
1995 Emergency Supplementals and Rescissions Act (Public Law 104–6).	(3,386)	(1,008)	
Self-Employed Health Insurance Act (Public Law 104–7)			(248)
Total enacted this session	(3,386)	(1,008)	(248)
ENTITLEMENTS AND MANDATORIES			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements other mandatory programs not yet enacted	(1,887)	3,189	
Total current level [1]	1,233,103	1,216,173	978,218
Total budget resolution	1,238,744	1,217,605	977,700
Amount remaining:			
Under budget resolution	5,641	1,432	
Over budget resolution			518

[1] In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, the total does not include $3,905 million in budget authority and $7,442 million in outlays in funding for emergencies that have been designated as such by the President and the Congress, and $841 million in budget authority and $917 million in outlays for emergencies that would be available only upon an official budget request from the President designating the entire amount requested as an emergency requirement.

Notes: Numbers in parentheses are negative. Detail may not add due to rounding.●

TIME FOR REAL FARM REFORM

● Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, no other legislation which is likely to come before the Congress this year will have more direct impact on my State, North Dakota, and the people who live there than the 1995 farm bill. For a farm State, for a State with a predominantly rural economy, it is critically important legislation.

When Congress and the President begin to draft that legislation, I believe it is essential that we be about the business of fundamental reform. The time for farm program facelifts has long since passed. It is time for real change, change that returns the farm program to its fundamental and original mission: helping family farmers survive and prosper.

I recently wrote a guest editorial which was published in a number of North Dakota newspapers which outlined my thinking on this important issue in some detail. I would like to share that article, and those thoughts, with my colleagues and ask that it be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

NO MORE FACELIFTS FOR THE FARM PROGRAM—IT'S TIME FOR REAL REFORM

(By U.S. Senator Byron L. Dorgan)

The new U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, Dan Glickman, is coming to North Dakota Friday at my invitation to meet with family farmers. His visit comes at both an opportune and very challenging time.

This year Congress will cut federal spending to reduce the deficit. It will also write a new five year farm program. The two are closely related. Budget pressures will limit the amount of money available for a farm program.

Farm program price supports have already been cut deeply—slashed by 62% since 1986—but still, some leaders in the new Congress are pushing for even deeper cuts. House Majority Leader Dick Armey (R–TX) and Senate Agriculture Committee Chair Richard Lugar (R–IN) are calling outright for the federal farm program to be phased down and, effectively, abolished.

Those of us who believe that a decent farm program is essential to the survival of family farmers face a major challenge. To retain a decent farm program, we are going to have to propose new, and more effective approaches. We must take a fresh look at what works and what doesn't in the farm program.

I hope that will be the focus of the discussion in North Dakota on Friday with the Secretary of Agriculture.

At the outset we have to admit that the current farm program doesn't work very well.

First, price supports are too low to offer real protection to family-sized farms. That's because the nation's largest farms—often big corporate farms—soak up too much of the farm program's funds.

Second, the current farm program is far too complicated.

Third, it is built on a ''supply management'' approach that no longer works. In the new global market place of the 1990's and beyond, it is virtually impossible for one nation to control supplies. When we cut production of a commodity, other countries eargerly step in and fill the gap.

The bottom line is that the current farm program does not do a good job serving as a safety net for family farmers nor does it do much to boost market prices for farm commodities.

Under the current program, we have ended up with more government employees to run the farm program, and fewer family farmers. That's moving in the wrong direction.